



[Majority Press Releases](#)

[Fact of the Day](#)

[Speeches](#)

FRIDAY, JUNE 17, 2005

THE WEEKLY CLOSER

FROM THE SENATE ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE
MAJORITY PRESS OFFICE

VOLUME 1, NUMBER 2

THE WEEK IN REVIEW...

- [Highway Bill Discussions Continue](#)

IN THE NEWS...

- [Climate Change and the Energy Bill](#)
- [Clear Skies Update](#)

IN CASE YOU MISSED IT...

- [Evidence is underwhelming \(by Senator James M. Inhofe for USA Today\)](#)

QUOTE OF THE WEEK...

“But there is yet one more Senate bill — the Ratepayers Protection Act of 2005 — that would address global warming hysteria as the quintessential junk science phenomenon it is.”

Steve Milloy
FoxNews.com
June 17, 2005

HIGHWAY BILL DISCUSSIONS CONTINUE

This week the conference committee continued negotiations on the Safe Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act (SAFETEA). The transportation legislation is important because it serves an economic development issue for our neighborhoods, communities and the nation. A safe, effective transportation system is the foundation of a growing economy. According to Department of Transportation (DOT) estimates, every \$1 billion of Federal funds invested in highway improvements creates 47,000 jobs. The same \$1 billion investment yields \$500 million in new orders for the manufacturing sector and \$500 million spread throughout other sectors of the economy.

Unfortunately, there are serious consequences if Congress further delays the process. State contract awards for the 2005 spring and summer construction season are going out to bid. If Congress fails to pass a bill soon, states will not know what to expect in federal funding and the uncertainty will potentially force states to delay putting these projects out to bid. According to a study done by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, an estimated 90,000 jobs are at stake nationwide. This problem is even more serious for northern-tier states that have shorter construction seasons. In many states, transportation departments have advanced state dollars to construct projects eligible for federal-funding in anticipation of action by Congress to increase those funding levels. Without a new bill, states are holding the bag until Congress acts.

[Return to the top](#)

IN THE NEWS...

Climate Change and the Energy Bill

On Monday, columnist [Robert Novak](#) called attention to some important points rarely made in the mainstream media. In discussing the debate on climate change, specifically implementation of the flawed Kyoto Treaty, Novak's White House source correctly asserts that "Kyoto was never about environmental policy It was designed as an elaborate, predatory trade strategy to level the American and European economies." Consider, as Novak also does, Margot Wallstrom, the Swedish vice president of the European Commission, who said the Kyoto Protocol was "not a simple environmental issue . . . this is about international relations, this is about economy – about trying to create a level playing field."

Aside from leveling the "playing field," mandatory caps on carbon would level the U.S. economy – and provide virtually no benefit. Research has shown that implementing Kyoto and other carbon cap policies would actually have very little effect on reducing temperatures. Assuming climate change alarmists are correct, we would only avoid .008° (Bingaman) -.029° C (McCain-Lieberman) in temperature by 2050. But the costs for implementing such policies are astounding. The National Black Chamber of Commerce and several other groups that oppose McCain-Lieberman [cited a study](#) revealing 1,306,000 jobs would be lost by 2020 under the measure. According to the same study, Senator Bingaman's plan, which is modeled on the National Commission on Energy Policy (NCEP) recommendation, would cost \$27 billion a year "with emission reductions results barely different from current baseline emissions." The study also reveals that the NCEP proposal would result in smaller emissions reductions than the President's ongoing voluntary program. There is no justification. Americans deserve better than legislation prompted by emotional rhetoric that delivers nothing but great expense.

Today in his [FoxNews.com column](#), Junk Science's Steve Milloy applauded Senate Inhofe's legislation to prevent costs associated with climate alarmism from being transferred to energy consumers, writing "...the Ratepayers Protection Act, introduced by Sen. James Inhofe, R-Okla., would ensure that the costs associated with voluntary actions taken by utilities under the guise of global warming are not passed on to consumers. 'As the need for those reductions is not grounded in science, it is important that those costs are not passed on to electricity consumers,' stated [the bill's media release](#). Sen. Inhofe's bill would rightly make utility shareholders, not consumers, responsible for footing the bill of corporate management folly concerning global warming. While it's not likely that companies looking to profit from global warming alarmism will support the Ratepayer Protection Act, the rest of us should rally behind Sen. Inhofe rather than bear the costs of all this hot air scheming."

Read the Majority Press [Fact of the Day](#) about the McCain-Lieberman and Bingaman amendments to the Energy Bill.

[Return to the top](#) 

Clear Skies Update

As the Democrats' clean air litigation strategy failed once again this week, the need for President Bush's Clear Skies legislation continues to prove to be the better way for improving the nation's air quality. The court this week, presided over by a Clinton appointed judge, rejected a Clinton-era Clean Air Act enforcement case against

Duke Energy Corp. At a heavy cost to tax payers, these failed law suits do nothing to improve air quality.

Clear Skies legislation provides a better approach for future emissions reductions through a cap-and-trade program and not by filing lawsuits against a handful of companies. Clear Skies will bring the majority of U.S. counties into compliance with the strict new health-based air quality standards implemented last year by the Bush Administration.

[Return to the top](#) 

IN CASE YOU MISSED IT...

USA Today, Opposing View

Wednesday, June 15, 2005

Evidence is underwhelming

By James M. Inhofe

Despite the lack of a scientific consensus to warrant such measures, climate change alarmists — in the heat of the summer for the scariest effect — are promoting mandatory caps on carbon dioxide emissions in the USA. It's a classic case of "ready, fire, aim."

Until recently, the foundation of climate change alarmism has been the so-called hockey stick graph. The graph, constructed by Dr. Michael Mann, a professor at the University of Virginia, and shaped like a hockey stick, purports to show a link between rising temperatures and human activity.

Recent Canadian research discredited the graph because of its errors and improper methodologies. An Environment Canada statistician agreed Mann's method "preferentially produces hockey sticks when there are none in the data." Dr. Hans von Storch, a contributor to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, called it "rubbish" methodologically, and Dr. Rob van Dorland, an IPCC lead author, said the IPCC "made a mistake by only including Mann's reconstruction and not those of other researchers."

In spite of this, some still seek to solve a problem even before it has been established one exists. Two Senate bills would, like the Kyoto Protocol, cap carbon dioxide emissions. Wharton Econometrics Forecasting Associates estimates that the costs of implementing Kyoto would cost an American family of four \$2,700 annually. Two international leaders once described Kyoto's intent. Margot Wallstrom, the European Union's commissioner on the environment, said Kyoto is "about leveling the playing field for big businesses worldwide," and French President Jacques Chirac called it "the first component of an authentic global governance."

MIT professor Dr. Richard Lindzen sums up the current state of affairs best: "Science, in the public arena, is commonly used as a source of authority with which

to bludgeon political opponents and propagandize uninformed citizens. ... A fairer view of the science will show that there is still a vast amount of uncertainty — far more than advocates of Kyoto would like to acknowledge." Based on that uncertainty, our constituents hardly need "global governance," but they do deserve responsible governance at home.

Sen. James M. Inhofe, R-Okla., chairs the Environment and Public Works Committee.

Bill Holbrook, Communications Director
Matt Dempsey, Deputy Press Secretary